

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. By this amendment, Claims 18, 21, 22 have been amended. Hence, Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. The amendments to the claims and the new claims do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, the amendments to the claims were made to improve the readability and clarity of the claims and not for any reason related to patentability. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed February 22, 2007 are addressed hereinafter.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 18, 21, and 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 18, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims have been amended to address the specific issues identified in the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 18, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-11, AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Dell. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-11 and 14, are patentable over Dell for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites a method for integrated audit and configuration comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

receiving a request from a user to analyze first configuration information with a
second set of configuration information;
receiving the first configuration information;

analyzing one or more parameters of the first configuration information with the second set of configuration information **to result in creating and storing comparison information**;
displaying the comparison information;
choosing one or more action mechanisms to provide to the user for each of the one or more parameters based on the comparison information; and
enabling the user to perform one or more actions associated with the one or more action mechanisms.” (emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 recites one or more features that are not taught or suggested by Dell. For example, as shown above, Claim 1 requires that the step of analyzing result in “creating and storing comparison information “ by a machine, since the step is machine-implemented. Such a feature is neither shown nor suggested by Dell, which does not make any provision for analyzing parameters of first and second sets of configuration information. Instead, Dell explicitly requires that users make the comparison of configuration information themselves.

The portion of Dell applied by the Office Action states “[t]his allows [a] . . . network administrator a quick means to review the differences in configuration between the two switches and avoid the repetitive and time consuming task of interfacing with both switches and performing a side by side comparison of their configuration settings manually”. (Dell, page 19, bottom paragraph).

The above portion of Dell is in contradiction with the language of claim 1, which recites, *inter alia*, a step of analyzing first and second sets of configuration information, to result in creating and storing that comparison information. Meanwhile, the feature of Dell described by the Office Action does not store anything, as claimed, but instead merely enables a user to “open a window displaying a side by side comparison of . . . two configuration files”. (Dell, page 20, list item 4).

Additionally, the Office Action states that “as a result of selecting the compare button, the information within each configuration file **is compared with each other** by displaying a side

by side comparison of the two configuration files.” (Office Action, page 3, paragraph 3, emphasis added). This assertion is incorrect. The present claim actually performs a comparison. Meanwhile, the portion of Dell cited within the Office Action merely makes it possible for the *user* to visually perform the comparison, which is not the same as a machine actually *performing* the comparison, as claimed.

Next, since the user within Dell’s disclosure must perform the comparison, it is not possible for the invention of Dell to then choose an action mechanism based on the comparison information, as that information is visually obtained by the user and not by Dell’s mechanism. This in turn makes the following enabling step impossible to achieve through Dell’s disclosure, as the mechanism within Dell does not store comparison information, and thus can not enable a user to take specific actions associated with action mechanism that arose as a result of the comparison information.

The Office Action goes on to assert that the choosing and enabling steps, inter alia, of claim 1 (as emphasized above) are anticipated by the “<<” and “>>” buttons shown in Dell’s FIG. 10. (Office Action, page 3, bottom paragraph). This assertion is also respectfully traversed. It is not possible for the “<<” and “>>” buttons to act as action mechanisms, nor can they enable a user to perform any actions associated with any action mechanisms, as claimed. Instead, Dell describes these buttons only for jumping to previous and next highlighted differences between two configuration files. (Dell, page 18, 3rd bullet-point). Dell then makes no further mention of the buttons. Thus, under no circumstances does any portion of Dell, or any other reference applied by the Office Action, suggest that Dell’s “<<” and “>>” buttons can give way to or cause the appearance of a hyperlink, clickable button, selectable check-box, or any

type of other action mechanism. Accordingly, the “<<” and “>>” buttons are misapplied with respect to claim 1.

Meanwhile, the action mechanisms recited in claim 1 are described as containing “actionable steps for each parameter or sub-parameter”. (specification, paragraph 46, lines 1-2; see also FIG. 2d). Three example action mechanisms might be a hyperlink, clickable button, or selectable check-box, for enabling a user to take various steps with regard to various chunks of configuration information. (specification, paragraph 46, lines 5-7). Many other action mechanisms could be used within the spirit and scope of the present invention.

Thus, the present claim actually performs a comparison, and then presents the user with a suitable type of action mechanism which could only arise from performing that comparison. Meanwhile, Dell forces users to make the comparison themselves. Although Dell assists the user by visually highlighting differences between two configuration files, and allows users to jump between those differences by using the “<<” and “>>” buttons, it is still incumbent upon Dell’s user to actually make the comparison themselves.

For at least the above reasons, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) should be withdrawn.

CLAIMS 2, 4, 5, 9-11 and 14

Claims 2, 4, 5, 9-11 and 14 all depend from Claim 1 and include all of the features of Claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 2, 4, 5, 9-11 and 14 are patentable over Dell for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claim 1. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2, 4, 5, 9-11 and 14 recite additional limitations that independently render them patentable over Dell.

REJECTION OF REMAINING CLAIMS

All remaining Claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly obvious over a variety of references using Dell as a base reference. However, all of these Claims either explicitly recite or depend from other Claims which recite, *inter alia*, action mechanisms, which as shown above are neither disclosed nor suggested by any combination of prior art, either by Dell or by any other reference. The secondary references do not cure this deficiency of Dell, and therefore any combination of Dell with any of the secondary references cannot provide the complete combination of features recited in the remaining claims.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejections of all remaining Claims are also defective, and should also be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP



Christopher M. Tanner

Reg. No. 41,518

Date: May 22, 07

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
(408) 414-1080 ext. 452
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: **Mail Stop Amendment**, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 5/22/07

by Martina Placid

Martina Placid